HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 4 Saturday, January 26, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

THE LIBRARY
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

The Robber Bosses: In the press galleries of Congress, where reporters seek brief, descriptive terms to facilitate their labors of composition, "The Robber Bosses" has been gaining currency in the past week.

Circulation of the term has been spurred by labor's defiance of a Congressional committee in which officials of the Teamsters Union invoked the Fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions about diversion of funds to personal use by labor officials. As Senator McCarthy put the question to the labor attorney, "Are you going to cover up for goons and crooks regardless of who is investigating them?"

Plain speaking like this, widely spread in the press, scarcely helps to make labor leaders popular. Indeed — some veteran observers here remark — "this is where we came in." Just as New Deal committees in 1933-34 led to coinage of the phrase "The Robber Barons," applied to Wall Streeters then on the spot, now "The Robber Bosses" serves to express the disgust of millions of citizens, including many who carry union cards, with the labor leaders who swing their weight so arrogantly across the national proscenium. So, at least, many observers on Capitol Hill view the matter.

This "show" of the past week has aroused conservatives on the Hill — and particularly those of the GOP. These men look at the labor problem much as the late Senator Taft did — believing that the party should appeal to the millions of members over the heads of their union leaders. Yet, they note that this probe lights up the political relationship between the leaders of the Teamsters Union — Beck and Hoffa — and the Eisenhower Administration. For Sherman Adams and Secretary of Labor Mitchell have sought to curry favor with "The Robber Bosses." (The Democrats, naturally, investigate the labor bosses who supported Ike, not those who went with Adlai.)

This (up until now) slow burn among GOP conservatives on Capitol Hill might well develop into a flash fire of revolt in Congress against the Administration. Certainly, the combustibles are present: conservative Republican members show sharp discontent with the astronomical budget; an avalanche of protests from exasperated businessmen constituents has reportedly swept the Capital; and the irate — literally — reactions from overtaxed citizens in the constituencies against the fantastic globaloney oratory (this is precisely how many Congressmen refer to Ike's Inaugural sentiments) feed the rising tempers in the Senate and House office buildings.

Such resentments — many agree — might well fuse into a clamor of protest against Secretary Mitchell and his pals, "The Robber Bosses."

Members of Congress ask why the Department of Labor did not uncover the abuses revealed by the McClellan Committee and why the Department of Justice has not moved to prosecute the offenders.

On the Foreign Front: The Chou-Bulganin declaration, pledging Red resistance to the Eisenhower Mideast Doctrine, is a deadly serious and menacing warning of war — say observers on diplomatic row. They compare it to the military alliance between Japan and Nazi Germany in 1940, which when unfurled in that year warned of something which turned out to be the Pearl Harbor of a year later. In 1941, the Berlin-Tokyo axis plunged the U.S. into war in Asia. A Red attack on Korea, Formosa or, more likely, Viet-Nam may prove the 1957 counterpart of Pearl Harbor. Or there might be a simultaneous Red attack on Iran and Viet-Nam. So assert foreign observers who believe that American papers are unwise to underestimate the Chou-Bulganin agreement.

● Heads of diplomatic missions here appraise the extravagant promises made by President Eisenhower in his Inaugural address, to spread globaloney all over the world, as not of serious intent but rather a piece of "psychological warfare," intended to frighten the Comintern and to win friends among neutralist countries. Whether it will accomplish these ends is another and debatable matter.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Foreign diplomats doubt that Nasser is as subdued as a rash of recent reports in American newspapers claim. Foreign intelligence reports say that the Egyptian may have an unpleasant surprise in store for the West. When the Suez Canal is supposed to be open again for traffic in the spring, Nasser may clamp down an embargo on passage of French, British and Israeli ships, blocking their course through the Canal unless their governments pay an indemnity for the damage done to Egypt in October by the armed attack of these three nations. What — it is asked — can the West do if Nasser takes this drastic step? So far, no one ventures to offer an answer.

● A striped pants official of the State Department visited National American Legion Commander W. C. Daniel and tried to modify that leader's strong opposition to inviting Tito of Yugoslavia to visit the U.S. The State Department man suggested that "out in the country" there might be much less agitation against Tito if his visit were confined to Washington, D. C., and to business conferences in Government offices or in his Embassy — no address to Congress, or unrolling of the red carpet. "But," retorted Daniel, "what will sicken the people out in the country is any contact at all between our Government and this bloody Red dictator."

For 1960: The political pot continues to boil, with various political figures maneuvering for position. At Inaugural time, Democrats Happy Chandler of Kentucky and Frank Clement of Tennessee acted like candidates at the Governors' Reception on January 20, held in the Statler Hotel, Washington. They rather "grabbed the show" from Vice President Nixon, who attended the reception.

The same day, Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) was interviewed on the ABC-TV, "College News Conference." He refused to commit himself to a preference between Nixon and Knowland for Presidential nomination, because "we might have many candidates in the field. I might get ambitious myself. So I'm not going to commit myself four years in advance."

Revolt Against Big Spending: The enormous size of the new Eisenhower Budget is the principal subject of conversation among members of Congress. Dismayed conservatives say it looks as if Ike may be going the way of FDR — who in 1932 promised a 25 per cent reduction in expenses and instead — after a few months of economy — turned to "spending" as the secret of political popularity and the remedy for all social ills.

During his 1952 campaign for the Presidency, General Eisenhower promised that his fourth Budget — the one coming up now — would bring Federal expenses down to $60 billion. Instead, it has climbed to $71.8 billion, only three per cent less than Truman's last Budget — sent to Congress at the peak of expenditures for the Korean War. (If expenditures for highways, social security and other items for which special taxes are levied are included, the Ike Budget goes to $85-plus billion!)

Fiscal experts here point out that if Eisenhower's 1952 campaign promise were fulfilled, the $12 billion difference would be equal to an across-the-board personal income tax cut of just under 30 per cent. (Estimated revenue in fiscal 1958 from individual income taxes, $41 billion.)

Moreover, say tax men, a reduction of $12 billion would not be difficult, if there were the urge to make it.

Ike's foreign aid proposals would cost nearly $5 billion. Many Congressmen would like that sum cut by at least $3½ billion, which would still leave ample provision for Nationalist China, South Korea, South Viet-Nam, and a few other special situations.

The cost of maintaining ground troops in Western Europe is estimated at $3 or $4 billion. Western Europe has a larger population than the United States and should provide its own ground defenses, say those Congressmen who would like our overseas commitments limited to "token" battalions plus retaliatory Air Force units.

Treasury Secretary Humphrey is said to believe the Pentagon has "gone mad." He believes several billions could be saved if the armed forces would suspend the purchase of obsolete items, and that $3 or $4 billion more would be saved by applying the Hoover recommendations to the Defense Department. Humphrey also believes another billion or two could be saved by applying the Hoover recommendations to other Government departments.

Since fiscal 1955, Federal spending has risen by $7.2 billion, with only about $2.7 billion going for security and defense programs. The rest includes an additional $1 billion for labor and welfare, $570 million for veterans' services and benefits, $554 million for agriculture, $457 million for natural resources, and $922 million for interest on the national debt.

To indicate other places where savings can be made, economy advocates offer several damning comparisons between Ike's next fiscal year and Truman's 1948-49 year:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fiscal '49, the information service (now USIA) cost $15 million; next year's, $175 million. "Public assistance" during the recession year 1948-49 cost $931 million; for next year, $1,684 million.

Public health: for '49, $174 million; for '58, $606 million.

Education, for '49, $65 million; for '58, $538 million.

Agriculture, conservation, etc., for '49, $3.5 billion; for '58, $5.5 billion.

Over-all total, for '49, $39.5 billion; for '58, $71.8 billion.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce, on January 23, urged Congressional Democrats to take the lead in an effort to cut the President's Budget, "for they are in the driver's seat to do something about it."

The Council said, "If the Democrats do take the lead in cutting this Budget, they should be able to count on the support of at least the economy-minded members from the other [Republican] side of the Congressional aisle."

Troubled members of Congress wish the people back home would start a "tax revolt." The more weak-kneed Congressmen on the Hill will go along with the President because that is the line of least resistance, but even this group would turn against the spending program if enough protests came in from the "grass roots."

> If you believe the people's earnings should be spent by them rather than by the bureaucracy, if you believe an across-the-board, 30 per cent cut in all personal income taxes is a desirable goal, why not do something? Write your Congressman, get your friends to write, get your civic clubs to pass resolutions.
>
> You can start a revolt against Big Spending in your own community.

The storm of protest against the Ike Budget has apparently caused the President (in his press conference on January 23) to take a defensive attitude on the subject. Additionally, the Capital is impressed by the huge volume of approving mail reportedly received by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey following his criticism of the spending Budget.

Indiana Conservative: Conservatives throughout the Nation hailed the Inaugural address of Indiana's new Governor, Harold W. Handley. Handley struck out at the encroachments of the Federal Government on the states, criticized foreign aid, and opposed Federal interference with the schools.

"Governor Handley," commented *The Indianapolis News*, "rightly warned that Indianans must never forget that their state is indeed sovereign — a sovereign state in a Federal republic — and that they must ever resist excessive central control." *The News* concluded that "if Governor Handley stands fast by his deep sense of conservatism . . . Indiana may look forward to four years of good government as a sovereign state."

The Indianapolis Times also welcomed the Handley Inaugural, praising it as "forthright," "thoroughly American," and "politically courageous."

Labor Front: Some observers expressed initial surprise that the Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers a few days ago adopted a pious resolution putting that union on record in hearty support of a thorough investigation of racketeering and corruption in unions. In view of certain widely overlooked circumstances, it should not have been any surprise.

First, UAW President Walter Reuther pulls the strings which make the puppets of Governor Mennen Williams' Democratic administration in Michigan dance to the UAW tune. Reuther regards the state as his private political domain.

In recent years, however, he has found his political control being challenged — in several cases successfully — by another unioneer, Teamsters' Brotherhood vice president James R. Hoffa, who works the Republican side of the Michigan political street.

Thus, it will serve Reuther's personal purposes to keep the Senate investigation hot on the trail of the Teamsters, at least until it turns the spotlight of publicity on some of the questionable practices and activities of Jimmy Hoffa. These practices and activities are such that a real probe quite conceivably might mean the end of Hoffa as a union boss, which automatically would eliminate him as a threat to Reuther.

Second, it is agreed generally that former AF of L unions will emerge from a full-scale racketeering inquiry with more black eyes than will pre-merger CIO units. Racketeering of the sort being probed is far more prevalent among AF of L than CIO unions, probably because the latter are younger and less susceptible to finagling by firmly entrenched leaderships.

Reuther is only a vice president of the AFL-CIO: he is tired of taking a back seat to its president, George Meany. If AF of L unions wind up with enough black eyes, their influence might diminish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the point that ex-CIO groups would take control. In short — is Reuther supplanting Meany? Could be.

UN and Mideast: Amidst the controversy stirred by the President's "Middle Eastern Doctrine," observers note, one point has emerged to which everyone lends silent, and in some cases vocal, agreement: even the "internationalists" now admit that the United Nations is useless — as well as potentially harmful.

- In his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said that if America "looks to the United Nations to form American policy, instead of fighting in the United Nations for what the American Government believes should be done, then we have committed an unprecedented abdication of responsibility and power."

- In his speech to the Congress, President Eisenhower said that "the Soviet Union vetoed action by the Security Council to require the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces from Hungary. And it has shown callous indifference to the recommendations, even the censure, of the General Assembly. The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved."

- Arthur Krock, writing in *The New York Times*, reported that Viscount Cherwell, a friend of Winston Churchill's, vigorously denounced the United Nations in the House of Lords: "It is 'nonsense,' concluded Churchill's 'Prof.,' for nations to submit their 'vital interests to a body so absurdly constituted' as the Assembly. Was Cherwell also expressing the views of his great friend?"

MacArthur: Senator Langer (R.-N.D.) proposed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 24 that General Douglas MacArthur be called to give the committee his views on the Eisenhower Doctrine. It is reported by reliable sources that this idea was inspired by a prominent Republican who phoned MacArthur the day before, and who told Langer that the General seemed to welcome the idea of testifying.

Washington correspondent (junior) wanted. May be recent college graduate. First letter should give full details, age, marital status, education, draft status, jobs held and at what salaries, party affiliation, references. Write Box 64, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

Silver Bloc Preparing Another Trick: Another pressure group is preparing to make it harder to balance the already overburdened Ike Budget. The silver interests in World War II allowed the Treasury to lend-lease the white metal to Allied countries and to let the Defense Plants Corporation borrow some of the metal slumbering in the West Point vaults. The bloc wrote in one condition, however: every single ounce of silver thus lent here or abroad must be returned after the war. But the bloc failed to foresee what would happen to it.

Now, nearly 12 years after the war, the silver is beginning to return. Of more than 400,000,000 ounces lend-leased abroad, over a fourth has come back. Its return is none too soon for the Treasury, whose free silver for minting subsidiary coins had almost run out. The Treasury might have had to buy silver for coinage in the open market, bidding against other buyers, despite the huge silver hoard impounded at West Point by the subsidy laws of the 1930's and 1940's; and this, of course, would have tended to raise the world market price and give the bloc an excuse to demand a hike in the special subsidy price accorded newly mined U.S. silver in 1946.

The cream of the jest is that the silver which is today returning because of the insistence of the wartime silver Senators now acts as a damper on the price. So the silver bloc braintrusters advocate the following: suggest to the debtor countries that they ask cancellation of remaining obligations to return the silver.

Letter from WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, U.S. Senator from California: "HUMAN EVENTS is one of the Nation's most informative publications. Your subscribers are important and they write letters — hundreds every week to us in Washington. Like all other members of the Senate and House, I read HUMAN EVENTS each week."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIV, No. 4 HUMAN EVENTS January 26, 1957

Article Section II

WHY I AM AN ANTI-INTELLECTUAL

By MEDFORD EVANS

I AM AN anti-intellectual because intellectuals, as the term is now used, are treacherous and stupid. They are treacherous, for they injure their benefactors; they are stupid, for they injure themselves. It is a vulgar fallacy to conceive of them as makers of civilization. They come into being as a result of civilization and proceed to turn civilization over to the most convenient horde of barbarians. They understand neither the generosity of their benefactors nor the violence of their destroyers, but characteristically betray the one, along with themselves, to the other.

In modern times the intellectuals have owed their subsistence and existence to the church, philanthropic capitalism, national governments, professional military establishments. They have turned upon every one of these.

In contrast, they have supported nazism, fascism, and communism — all of which treat them with contempt. (One scholar contends that the intellectuals are attracted to Marxism *because* Marxist leaders treat them with contempt.) It will be objected that they opposed nazism and fascism, but they did this only when they were beyond the borders of the controlled territory. Since communism's reach is world-wide, they do not speak out against it anywhere.

Intellect is the greatest gift we have, but as Bacon said, studies teach not their own use. Therefore the non-intellectual virtues are more important than the intellectual ones (and this is an intellectual judgment). Faith, hope, and charity; fortitude, temperance, etc. are primary. The intellectuals are typically deficient in these, being fickle, cynical, self-indulgent, and cowardly. Unfortunately, this is not all. They are also deficient in the intellectual virtues of perspicacity, wit, discrimination and logic. Perhaps we ought to grin and bear it when they betray the rest of us, but in the name of reason we must demur at the way in which they betray themselves.

Notice that intellectuals are never so called when they are actually using their intelligence in a legitimate profession. A nuclear physicist is not an "intellectual" while he is calculating a cross section in the laboratory, but he becomes one as soon as he walks into the Senate Office Building or writes a letter to the *New York Times*. This is so because a good physicist cannot fool another good physicist about physics, though about politics even a lousy physicist may fool all the people some of the time.

FOR THOSE WHO came in late, while we cannot stop now to define "intellectuals" at great length, an intellectual is one who

(a) thinks it all right for a Government employee to be a Communist, but wrong for him to represent a business corporation,

(b) thinks atomic secrets should be published, but admires Communists who plead the Fifth Amendment,

(c) thinks American fear of communism is hysteria, but that Soviet fear of "capitalist encirclement" is only what one must expect,

(d) thinks "Jim Crow" must be ended now, but that the Hindu caste system requires enormous patience,

(e) thinks it outrageous that veteran Congressional investigator J. B. Matthews should have in effect accused Harry F. Ward and Jack McMichael of pro-communism, but splendid that "liberal" G. Bromley Oxnam should have done the same thing,

(f) thinks theology is intellectually ridiculous, but that professors of theology who attack capitalism deserve great respect,

(g) thinks that Dr. Kinsey, the sex expert, was correct in saying that science has no concern with morals, and that the real greatness of Dr. Oppenheimer is seen in his "moral" objections to the hydrogen bomb,

(h) thinks that Supreme Court decisions must be carried out because they are the "law of the land," and that Lincoln's defiance of the Dred Scott decision was a mark of his magnanimous patriotism,

(i) thinks Stalin alive was the well-meaning prisoner of sinister men in the Kremlin, and that Stalin dead is a sinister tyrant from whom the well-meaning men in the Kremlin are fortunately delivered,

(j) thinks the radioactive fall-out of U.S. H-bomb tests is highly dangerous, and that fall-out which seems to come from Soviet territory shows that the Soviets treat their scientists better than we do ours and so have bigger and better H-bombs,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(k) thinks that, of course, communism is bad; but that it is unshakably in the saddle in Russia and China; that Soviet power is forging irresistibly ahead of the West; and that the real danger is anti-communism.

Gallup Polls show, according to my observation, that, on issues involving our national sovereignty, college graduates in this country tend to vote for a weak policy far more often than do citizens with only elementary-school training. High school graduates are in between. Thus the trend of intellectual training in the United States is toward the liquidation of the sovereignty of the United States. This trend is encouraged by those who know, or should know, that emphasis in Soviet education is on absolute and unqualified sovereignty for the Soviet Union. Obviously, the result of the combination of these concurrently operating forces—one in the U.S.A. against national sovereignty, and one in the U.S.S.R. for national sovereignty — is to increase the probability that Soviet sovereignty will supersede American sovereignty. The probability would be far greater than it is were it not for the confused state of affairs in Moscow.

Concerning this matter, intellectuals are generally classifiable as follows:

(1) those who believe Soviet power must be checked, but do not know how to check it and are opposed to every practical suggestion for checking it, such as positive assertion of U.S. sovereignty in the protection of every U.S. interest,

(2) those who regretfully accept the idea of Soviet world power as inevitable, but think it "hysterical" to admit their view in public,

(3) those who accept with pleasure the thought of Soviet world power, but think it imprudent to admit their view in public,

(4) those who actively — under more or less transparent cloaks — cooperate with the Communists to bring about Soviet world power.

ALL THESE GROUPS except the first practice active suppression of free inquiry and free discussion, and even the first group fears genuine frank discussion. The most striking characteristic of intellectuals today is their guilty reticence, their lack of candor. This precisely at the time when they say they want candor. If we may interpret their words by their actions, then what intellectuals mean by candor is that a university faculty member should be free to wire-tap a jury room, but that an F.B.I. agent should not be allowed to wire-tap a Communist; that a Congressional investigating committee is bad if headed by Senator McCarthy, good if headed by Senator Hennings; that Senator McCarthy deserves censure for speaking harshly to General Zwicker, but that attention should not be directed to the recent British libel suit against Justice William O. Douglas, concerning some words considered "harsh" by the plaintiff, and apparently by Mr. Douglas himself. (The Justice settled out of court by apologizing to Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, paying court costs, and agreeing to delete certain passages from his book *North from Malaya.*)

What intellectuals mean by candor is that Dr. Oppenheimer, who has repeatedly lied to responsible Government officials, should be invited to lecture at Harvard, and that Alger Hiss, who has served a term in the penitentiary *for perjury*, should be invited to lecture at Princeton.

I do not wish to fall out with friends over terminology, but would not "intellectual" be a better term than "liberal" to identify today's secular pharisees? "Liberal" suggests a political philosophy of some kind, while "intellectual" may suggest a class in the Marxian sense. And it is as a class that they behave. Without dignity, honor, or intelligence, they are moved by appetite, controlled by mob spirit, and guided by flashes of cunning from a few leaders who, cowardly as Hobbes, are attached to what they take for Leviathan.

And yet it will not do. These people are authoritarian, dogmatic, irrational, tendentious, and obscurantist — especially authoritarian. The man they admire most is Einstein, because they understand him least. To call these "intellectuals" is a case of *lucus a non lucendo* — to call them by those qualities that, most conspicuously, they lack. It is precisely as appropriate as Voltaire thought the name "Holy Roman Empire" for a domain of shadowy extent, ruled by worldly Germans.

Come to think of it, I am anti-intellectual because I am pro-intellect.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Medford Evans, author of *Secret War for the A-Bomb*, is Professor of Social Sciences at Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Two Faces of Adlai Stevenson," September 15, 1956.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIV, No. 4 HUMAN EVENTS January 26, 1957

Article Section I

WHY THE REPUBLICANS LOST THE CONGRESS
And How They Can Win It Back

By CONGRESSMAN RALPH W. GWINN

SEVERAL EXPLANATIONS have been advanced for the failure of the Republican party to gain a majority in Congress in last fall's election. To those who have observed the Republican trend in recent years, the real explanation is not far to seek: in my judgment, the Republicans lost because the party treats Congressional elections as mere "side shows" to the "big tent."

The dominant theory, which the recent election should have thoroughly exploded, is that Congressmen and Senators can be elected by "riding the coattails" of a popular Presidential candidate. By acting on this belief, Republicans fail to take an obvious lesson from the Democratic party in 1948. The Democrats thought they could not elect Truman, and went about the job of electing a Democratic Congress. They did it, and elected Truman in the bargain. So the President rode in on the coattails of Congress.

In a parallel situation last year, many Democrats wrote Adlai Stevenson off as impossible to elect. The Democrats, socialists, and "liberals" went out to elect a majority to Congress. and did it — without any coattails.

On the Republican side, we have seen several attempts to ride the coattails of the President, on the theory that voters want "new" Republicans to represent them in Congress. When the President last fall won re-election by nine million votes, no less than five of these "new" Republicans went down to defeat. If the "coattail" theory were correct, Langlie in Washington, McKay in Oregon, Thornton in Colorado, Bender in Ohio, and Duff in Pennsylvania should have defeated their Democratic opponents. But they all lost. Where is the theory now?

ALL OF THIS shows that, while interest in a Presidential election will bring out a larger total number of voters, it will not determine the way the votes are distributed among opposing Congressional candidates. In my own district, the 27th of New York, my percentage of the vote has varied less than two per cent between Presidential and non-Presidential years. The same is true of many other Congressmen who must win or lose on their own merits.

The Democrats, the AFL-CIO, the ADA, and other so-called "left-wing" groups concentrate heavily on Congressional elections. They will spend 20, 30, or even 50 thousand dollars on a race for the House. Republicans, on the other hand, spend little or no money — apart from what the candidate himself can raise — to help pay expenses at the grassroots level. This severely limits the effort that can be made in meetings, advertising and televising the campaign issues, mailings, providing transportation, registering and getting out the vote on election day. Yet these are the very things that often tip the balance in a Congressional election.

Republican precinct leaders often have not had enough money to buy coffee and doughnuts for pep meetings. Candidates or their friends have to provide personally for such election expenses. The bare minimum requirement for two mailings in a Congressional constituency of 200,000 voters is around $15,000. That merely represents a beginning, and where is it going to be scraped together? Imagine the President and Vice President in such a plight!

To cite one example: A Congressman in the New York area received $500 from the National Congressional Committee. He did not get a dime from the National, State or County Republican Committees. Yet he was expected to contribute to all of them, and did. He spent less than one-third of the estimated disbursements of his Democrat-liberal-socialist opponent.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the candidate for Congress is new and comparatively unknown, the job of getting himself elected and raising his own campaign fund is especially tough. And that is why there is a serious dearth of qualified Republican candidates willing to enter national politics.

If the Republican party is to spend $7 million every four years on a Presidential election, it could spend at least a million and a half in 100 closely contested Congressional districts — i.e., about $15,000 per district. The effect of these additional funds, although the figure ought to be closer to $25,000, would be immense, since it seems inconceivable that the Democrats can raise their expenditures much above what they have spent in the last two elections. Given the obvious conservative trend now under way in the country, it seems safe to say that this increased effort would install a comfortable Republican majority in the House.

IN THE LAST ELECTION, according to the estimates of careful analysts, the Republicans could have carried at least 25 additional districts if they had assembled suitable candidates and sufficient financial support. These 25 districts would have given them control of the House. A national broadcast costs about $100,000. The Republicans could have divided up this sum — the cost of *one* broadcast — distributing $5,000 apiece among 20 districts. Additional funds could have made a vital difference in each district, and a vital difference in the final lineup in the House.

As it is now, the election district leader with not a dime in his pocket for district expenses compares his financial situation with the fantastic expenditures for the two top candidates. His reaction is: "What's the use?" His job is a thankless one, year in and year out. On top of this, Republican patronage in the last four years has been badly mismanaged. All of this shows up clearly in the election results.

One suggested remedy for the inadequate attention given to the grassroots struggle strikes me as a good one. It is this: there should be state directors in each state representing the national committee. Their job would be to see that more competent men were drafted to run, and to insure that adequate funds were provided for these candidates. No competent man cares to stick his neck out unless he knows that support will be forthcoming. He does not want the job badly enough to put up all the money by himself.

The party's prospects for Congressional candidates are good. Lack of attention to selection of and financial aid for candidates is inexcusable. Indeed it may prove disastrous by throwing away a natural advantage (the conservative character of much of the country) in the fight against socialism. If the Republicans stopped letting the Democrats beat their candidates in the almost mechanical phases of raising and making effective use of funds, we should elect a Republican Congress. If we do that, it also follows that we shall elect a Republican President.

WE SHOULD REMEMBER that, with the opposition in the Congressional saddle, a Republican President labors under a great disadvantage. He must either sign or veto Democratic bills. When the balance of power in Congress rests with a tightly organized socialist-liberal bloc of about 100 members, many of the measures offered for his signature will inevitably be tinged with socialism. Politically speaking, he is placed in such a position that he must sign much of this pro-socialist legislation into law. That is our dilemma.

Now, when it is almost too late, we can see that there is no place in "the middle of the road" where the "new Republicanism" can stand. By trying to gain a foothold there we have lost our balance — and wound up in the ditch. It is clear that the socialists, American variety, have been consistently outsmarting us. But if we concentrate our efforts on the contests in the Congressional districts, we can tap the conservative sentiment of the people and put the socialists on the run.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Mr. Gwinn is serving his seventh consecutive term as Representative from the 27th Congressional District of New York. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Education's Armageddon," October 15, 1955.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED